



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

perception and his general intelligence is very low. A dog which has suffered the loss of the anterior cortex has usually a tendency to emaciation, while one whose brain has been operated on posteriorly is always fat; the former animal is also liable to a severe skin disease accompanied by itching.—*Pflüger's Archiv*, Bd. 34, s. 450.

PSYCHOLOGY.

THE PSYCHICAL RELATION OF MAN TO ANIMALS.¹—Professor LeConte's article opens as follows: "In the *Review* for November, 1878, I published an article on 'Man's place in nature.' The present article may be regarded as a continuation of the subject from a different point of view. In the former article I tried to show how, without violating the laws and analogies of nature, the spirit of man may be conceived to have arisen by progressive individuation out of the forces of nature, through the vital principle of plants and the anima of animals. In this I wish to fix attention on the last and most important step, and to determine, if possible, its nature. I wish to show in what consist the essential differences between the spirit of man and the anima of animals."

Professor LeConte admits the probable evolution of the human mind out of the animal mind, but believes that at some point of history, one perhaps coincident with the origin of the human species, a new type of mental power originated, which constitutes the spirit of man. He illustrates this proposition by reference to the history of development of human individuals at the present day. He traces the appearance of this especial power in the growth of the mind of the child, in language, in useful art, in fine art, in thought proper, in self-consciousness, and in free will. The power in question is simply the power of generalization. It commences in thought, in which it is the perception of law; it appears in speech in the power of expression of such perception of law; in useful art in the conscious working for a purpose; in fine art in the perception and execution of harmonies. These propositions are clearly presented and ably argued. They express a great truth, one which is probably true of all normal human beings. It is, however, not so certain that the power of generalization is limited to man. It is probably not so limited, but exists in a small degree in the mental operations in the highest animals. Hence we cannot perceive that Professor Le Conte proves in this way the existence of a "human spirit," distinct from "the anima of animals." Professor Le Conte does not, it appears to us, grant sufficient mentality to animals, especially in his discussion of imagination (p. 252). His belief, however, that the memory of animals is not, in their minds, distinguished from present events, is probably partly true, though we can scarcely believe that the highest animals do not retain an idea of the true successional relation of events.

¹ By Professor Jos. LeConte, from the *Princeton Review* (no date on the separata).

Self-consciousness is regarded by Le Conte as peculiar to man. This may be, but we have not yet looked into the recesses of the minds of the lowest races of man, nor do we know the conditions of the minds of the chimpanzee and orangutan in this respect.

The author believes in free-will as that form of mental activity "in which consequences, especially moral consequences, are presented to the mind and weighed; when impulses, solicitations, motives, are weighed one against another; when all these mental conditions become themselves in their turn the objects of conscious thought, and we feel distinctly conscious that we ourselves determine, and are therefore responsible for, the final result," etc. This form of stating the case will naturally be regarded by the determinists as a *petitio principii*. If the author of it had wished to strengthen his position as fully as it is susceptible of support, he should not have omitted the argument to be derived from the condition of ignorance coincident with high intelligence, where the experience which is the condition of automatism is wanting, and when, therefore, if progress is made, acts must be free if they are ever so. Though this hypothesis¹ is not a demonstration, it is as near to it as we shall ever get, and preferable to mere assertions of our belief in our freedom. In one paragraph, under the head of free-will, Professor Le Conte allows his theology to get ahead of his philosophy (p. 259). He says "there is a free-will, which is free only in the sense of self-determined, and therefore morally responsible, but is nevertheless unwillingly restrained by and chafes against the impassable bounds set about it by the all-embracing will of God, which is the perfect law of Righteousness—and there is a freer will, freer because no longer restrained by law; because the law of righteousness is freely accepted as the law of its activity; because it moves in loving accord with the absolute will." Now to say nothing of the assumption contained in this paragraph as to the origin and nature of the law of righteousness, the assumption of superior freedom of will on the part of him who obeys this law, is illogical. That man in whom the law of righteousness is habitually obeyed is, so far as this fact is in evidence, as much of an automaton as he who obeys only the laws of his animal instincts. The period of creation, which is a period of labor, is preëminently the period of freedom, and good habits are clearly just as automatic as bad ones. *It is however not necessary to believe that a freedom of will once gained need ever be lost.*

Finally, this supposed freedom of will cannot be attributed to animals. But it is far from certain that it is possessed by all men, that its assumption as a distinctively human characteristic is not exact. It may be rather a *possibility* for men, and as such more

¹ On the origin of the Will, by E. D. Cope. *Penn Monthly*, 1877, p. 435.

likely to prove the "spirit" or "soul" of man, so much talked of, and so little explained, than any other mental quality.—*E. D. C.*

MORE CONCERNING CATS' FOOD.—It was said by some eminent man that no one could know any one subject perfectly without knowing a little of everything. I base my claim to this universal knowledge on cats.

On our old place in the country we maintained a small standing army of cats, to keep down the rats, which had overrun the house and farm-buildings, and had defied fire-arms, poison and traps. These cats were not pets; they lived very greatly in the woods and fields and were just enough domesticated to give a fair chance of observing their ways. It was soon perceived that there was almost as much diversity of taste among them, in regard to food, as there is among human beings. They all ate meat and milk, and there, I think, the community of taste ended.

There were many generations before my own recollection serves me very clearly. The first one that stands out very clearly in my memory is "Old Trilobite" so-called, somewhat viciously, not from her extreme antiquity, but on account of a peculiar *trill* in her voice. Old Trilobite was a small, slender Maltese. She lived little in the house, save in the coldest part of the winter; she was a mighty hunter, and the mother of a numerous and hardy progeny of almost every possible variety.

She would not touch butter, nor anything made with it, although it was the best of fresh butter, nor would she eat anything sweet. She was partial to sour milk. She was often absent for days on hunting excursions in the woods; on her return she refused every kind of butcher's meat, but it was accidentally discovered that she would eat *raw salt pork* on such occasions; she also demanded bread, and would eat a quantity of it. I do not remember any other cat that ate salt pork, or indeed any salt meat or fish (unless it had been very much "freshed," which amounts to the same thing), and old Trilobite seemed only to eat it as a corrective to an exclusive game diet.

"Jack," one of Trilobite's kittens, resembled her in many respects as to habits, but did not accord with her dietary. She ate cake. She was also very partial to cheese, which Trilobite would not touch. Cats differ greatly as to their liking for cheese. Some are extravagantly fond of it; others will not touch it.

Cats, in general, like green vegetables. Asparagus is a favorite. Corn, beans and peas many cats will eat raw. Corn, Dr. Dimmock mentions, is often eaten by cats who do not care for other vegetables. Potatoes, generally, are refused. As an odd taste, I remember that of one who would eat the *peels* of boiled potatoes, but not the potatoes themselves; in this case it was the mere skin stripped carefully off, with little or no potato adhering to it.

Pet cats, Dr. Dimmock has remarked, will usually eat anything

the petter eats, or at least try to do so. I have seen them eat candy, dates and figs. One, only a semi-pet, who usually rejected sweets, was found one day picking out and eating the raisins from a piece of cold pudding.

Some cats will positively eat nothing but meat. I had one such. He was a yellow and black brindle, and I understood that this was a hereditary trait. But he once made an unexpected raid on some cream-cakes, and once condescended to eat Brighton biscuit. My present cat, "Pug," has much of the same tastes. He will now and then, out of politeness, take a bit of something else, but will not really eat anything but meat. He does not, however, like it raw, except when very hungry, a few bits of raw beef, other meats not at all. I have known of cats who would eat *only* raw meat, but never had such a one.

Almost all cats will eat eggs—cooked or raw. "Pug" would, in his younger days, but he is apt to refuse them now. "Nanny Longclaws" (originally "Ninon de l'Enclos") was so fond of eggs that breaking the shells would bring her rushing into the house even from such a distance that one would have thought she could not hear the sound.

They are, I think, to a cat, fond of fish—many extravagantly so. Oysters are in the same standing as cheese among them. Some will cry bitterly for them as soon as they perceive they are on hand; others reject them positively.

"Blanche," one of the two cats now attached to the establishment, will, I believe, eat *everything* except fruit and salt pork. She was born omnivorous, not having been especially petted in her kittenhood, nor brought up on a miscellaneous diet.

One Maltese cat, attracted probably by the musky odor, would not only drink the water in which India ink had been mixed by washing the brushes, but lick the saucer on which the ink had been rubbed. They are partial to perfumes.

A great many of them, as Dr. Dimmock observes, will catch and eat insects. "Blanche" has a great liking for dor-bugs. Moths are favorites too. "Squash-bugs," I judge, are not, remembering the highly disgusted expression and attitude one assumed after an attempt to deal with one of those highly-flavored creatures. Devil's darning needles I have seen caught and devoured. Grasshoppers, I think, are usually acceptable. I, too, had a cat who used to catch and bring them to me. Another one caught frogs and brought them to me, and, I fancied, was rather disappointed that I did not eat them. They will kill snakes, and sometimes partially eat them.

Much that is interesting can be said about the long-neglected and greatly-calumniated cat. I think its psychology deserves attention. I have observed in them a capacity for friendship among themselves.—*Francis M. Slack, Librarian Mus. Comp. Zoology.*